

REMARKS CONCERNING THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES FOR *Callopanchax* MYERS 1933. Z.N.(S.) 1910
(see volume 27, pages 246-249)

By Dirk F. E. Thys van den Audenaerde (*Musée Royal de l'Afrique Centrale, Tervuren, Belgium*)

I have to make objections against the proposed suppression of *Roloffia* Stenholz Clausen, 1966 and against the proposed validation of *Callopanchax* Myers, 1933. Main objections can be summarized as follows:

1. Boulenger (1915, p. 38-39) redescribed and figured some fishes as *Fundulus sjoestedti* Lönnberg, 1895, without a control or comparison with the type-specimens, and even without a serious comparison of his description with the original description. Although such practice can be comprehensible for that time (= beginning of World War I), it does not make necessary the perpetuation of the errors committed, and the description and the types of Lönnberg remain perfectly valid for nomenclature.

2. Myers (1933, p. 184) created the subgenus *Callopanchax* for the species *Fundulus sjoestedti* Lönnberg, 1895. His morphologic concept for this species however was based on the description of Boulenger, and without examination of Lönnberg's material. This is more or less explicitly explained in the 1933 paper and fully commented on in the 1971 request.

Creation of a new subgenus for a not well known species of a zoological group where the taxonomy at the species level is in a real tangle, and with only one aquarium-specimen for examination and without examination of the types should remain exceptional and only if not otherwise possible. There is no reason for validating afterwards the possible errors caused by the lack of material and by the non-examination of the type-material.

3. Stenholz Clausen (1966, 1967) has pointed out that *F. sjoestedti* Lönnberg, 1895 in fact is a senior synonym for *Aphyosemion caeruleum* (Boulenger, 1915). There is no doubt in regard to this synonymy. The subgenus *Callopanchax* (type-species *F. sjoestedti*) thus becomes a junior synonym of *Fundulopanchax* Myers, 1924 (type-species: *A. caeruleum*). There is no reason to modify here the general priority rule.

4. The species described erroneously by Boulenger (1915) as *F. sjoestedti* thus becoming nameless, H. S. Clausen proposed the names *Roloffia* gen. nov. and *occidentale* sp. nov. for this taxon.

5. The names *Roloffia*, whether as genus or subgenus, and *occidentale* became immediately widely accepted and used in German, Dutch, Danish and American-English aquarium papers. The fish being a popular aquarium-fish, this constitutes a bulk of papers, and the eventual suppression of the name *Roloffia* certainly would cause a lot of unnecessary confusion.

6. The whole case is presented now by Myers as if he feels upset by the action of Clausen. Such possible personal feelings should not influence zoological nomenclature. Myers (1971, p. 248, para. 11) says "I must dissent from the implied conclusion that I based two new generic names on the same species", but in fact he did so, and his error is based on his omission to examine the types of Lönnberg's *Fundulus sjoestedti*.

7. The request to suppress the designation of a type-species (*F. sjoestedti*) for *Callopanchax* Myers 1933 in a case where the designation is simple, clear and doubtless is very unusual, and should be avoided, because it can introduce a long series of other requests for suppressions.

The request to suppress *Roloffia* Stenholz Clausen, 1966 in favour of *Callopanchax* Myers 1933 for the species *Aphyosemion occidentale* Clausen, 1966 is in contradiction to the principle of priority as the name *Roloffia* is the first name proposed at the generic level for a specimen of the taxon now known as *Roloffia occidentale* Clausen.